IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Richard J. Ericson

Serial No.: 09/162,821

Filing Date: September 29, 1998

Docket No.: OT-43

Date: September 12, 2000

Group Art: 3652

Examiner: S. McAllister

Title: ELEVATOR SYSTEM HAVING DRIVE MOTOR LOCATED BELOW THE

ELEVATOR CAR

Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

This request for reconsideration is in response to the Office Action mailed June 12, 2000 and having a shortened period of response set to expire on September 12, 2000. Claims 2-14 and 16-28 were pending in the Application and subject to a restriction requirement. Based upon a provisional election, Claims 2-6, 13, 14, 16-20, 27 and 28 were examined and Claims 8-12 and 22-26 were withdrawn from consideration. Applicant hereby affirms this election without traverse.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 16, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gale in view of Tokyo Rope. According to the Office Action, Gale discloses an elevator car and counterweight coupled to a motor by a flat rope, but does not disclose that the suspension rope is flat. According further to the Office Action, Tokyo Rope discloses the use of a flat rope for suspension. The Office Action then alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the suspension rope of Gale by making it flat as taught by Tokyo Rope to make it more flexible and corrosion resistant.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. There is a misunderstanding of the content of the Tokyo Rope reference. A complete translation of this document (a copy of which is included herein) clearly describes this rope as a ribbon-type rope used as a balancing or compensation rope used in elevator systems (see page 2, last paragraph). This is further bore out by the objective of this invention, which is to replace the prior art, knitted together